

Clayton	Hoefel	Nethercutt
Clement	Hoekstra	Ney
Clyburn	Holden	Northup
Coble	Holt	Norwood
Coburn	Hooley	Nussle
Collins	Horn	Oberstar
Combest	Hostettler	Obey
Condit	Hoyer	Olver
Conyers	Hulshof	Ortiz
Cook	Hunter	Ose
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Owens
Costello	Hyde	Oxley
Cox	Inslee	Packard
Coyne	Isakson	Pascarell
Cramer	Istook	Pastor
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Pease
Cubin	Jefferson	Pelosi
Cummings	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Cunningham	John	Peterson (PA)
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Davis (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Phelps
Davis (VA)	Jones (NC)	Pickering
Deal	Kanjorski	Pickett
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pitts
DeGette	Kasich	Pombo
DeLauro	Kelly	Pomeroy
DeLay	Kennedy	Portman
DeMint	Kildee	Price (NC)
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)
Diaz-Balart	Kind (WI)	Quinn
Dickey	King (NY)	Radanovich
Dicks	Kingston	Rahall
Dingell	Klecza	Ramstad
Dixon	Knollenberg	Rangel
Doggett	Kolbe	Regula
Dooley	Kucinich	Reyes
Doyle	Kuykendall	Reynolds
Dreier	LaFalce	Riley
Duncan	LaHood	Rivers
Dunn	Lampson	Rodriguez
Edwards	Lantos	Roemer
Ehlers	Largent	Rogan
Ehrlich	Larson	Rogers
Emerson	Latham	Rohrabacher
English	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	Lazio	Roukema
Evans	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Everett	Lee	Ryan (WI)
Farr	Levin	Ryun (KS)
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Sabo
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Salmon
Fletcher	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez
Foley	Linder	Sanders
Forbes	LoBiondo	Sandlin
Ford	Lofgren	Sanford
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Frank (MA)	Luther	Scarborough
Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Frost	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Gallegly	Markey	Serrano
Ganske	Mascara	Sessions
Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)	Shadegg
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)	Shaw
Gephardt	McCrery	Shays
Gibbons	McGovern	Sherman
Gilchrest	McHugh	Sherwood
Gillmor	McInnis	Shimkus
Gilman	McIntosh	Shows
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Shuster
Goode	McKeon	Simpson
Goodlatte	McKinney	Sisisky
Goodling	Meek (FL)	Skeen
Goss	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Graham	Menendez	Slaughter
Granger	Metcalfe	Smith (MI)
Green (TX)	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Green (WI)	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Gutknecht	McDonald	Snyder
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	Spence
Hansen	Miller, George	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Minge	Stabenow
Hastings (WA)	Mink	Stark
Hayes	Moakley	Stearns
Hayworth	Mollohan	Stenholm
Hefley	Moore	Strickland
Herger	Moran (KS)	Stump
Hill (IN)	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Hill (MT)	Morella	Sununu
Hilleary	Murtha	Sweeney
Hilliard	Myrick	Talent
Hinche	Nadler	Tancredo
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Tanner
Hobson	Neal	Tauscher

Tauzin	Turner	Waxman
Taylor (MS)	Udall (CO)	Weldon (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Udall (NM)	Weldon (PA)
Terry	Upton	Weller
Thomas	Velazquez	Wexler
Thompson (CA)	Vento	Weygand
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thornberry	Vitter	Wicker
Thune	Walden	Wilson
Thurman	Walsh	Wise
Tiahrt	Wamp	Wolf
Tierney	Waters	Woolsey
Toomey	Watkins	Wu
Towns	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Traficant	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)

## NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Paul

## NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Gordon	McDermott
Bachus	Greenwood	McNulty
Bateman	Gutierrez	Meehan
Becerra	Houghton	Pallone
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Blagojevich	(TX)	Porter
Blunt	Johnson, E.B.	Rothman
Crane	Jones (OH)	Royce
Davis (IL)	Klink	Rush
Delahunt	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Doolittle	Lowey	Smith (TX)
Engel	Martinez	Weiner
Eshoo	Matsui	Young (FL)
Ewing	McCullum	

□ 1934

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3844

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 3844.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER  
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 701

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 701.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3573, THE  
KEEP OUR PROMISES TO AMERICA'S MILITARY RETIREES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this government offered a comprehensive employment contract to our military retirees. As a former member of the armed services, I was personally presented the package in the 1960s. I remember the sales pitch quite well, for the Army was very honest in pointing out the pros and cons of a military career.

The negatives were, first, that you might get killed or maimed in the line of duty but if you survived, you would have to move your family from one side of the country to the other every couple of years, maybe even overseas, and you would be paid far less than you would in a similar skill civilian job in spite of having to deal with these hardships. The supposedly offsetting positives were that your out-of-pocket living expenses would be far less, since major expense items such as health care would be covered directly by the Army, both during your active duty years and in retirement. Retirement was available after 20 years of service at half of your last paycheck.

Therefore, we were told we could afford to work and retire for far less than our jobs would command in the private sector or the Federal civilian workforce, for that matter, because of all of these great benefits. We would not need a big retirement check since we would have fully funded health care for life.

We could live off a lot less since we would never face big health care bills. I was homesick for Georgia the last time I heard that pitch in the Republic of Vietnam in 1969, so I passed on the deal. Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell of Smyrna, Tennessee, took the government at its word and stayed in for over 21 years. Sergeant Terrell retired in Smyrna because of access to military benefits at the Smyrna Air Force Base. His retirement pay is \$14,676 a year for both Earl and his wife. That is below the Federal poverty line, but that did not bother the couple that much since they would not have to worry about health care costs so they could live off the entire \$14,000.

The deal started to go sour 6 years after Sergeant Terrell settled down in Smyrna when the Federal Government closed down the Smyrna Air Force Base. Sergeant Terrell has suffered a stroke and had heart bypass surgery. Mrs. Terrell had heart valve surgery just in January and has also undergone surgeries for an ovarian cyst and back problems.

Without access to military health care, Earl and his wife now are paying \$5,760 a year to Blue Cross and Blue Shield. That is 39 percent of his retirement income. That leaves the Terrells with less than \$9,000 a year to live on. The Federal poverty line for a family of two is over \$16,000. Since 1995, the Terrells have paid nearly \$29,000 of their retirement income for health care that was promised free in exchange for 20 years of military service.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of this House, I ask you, have we fulfilled our side of the employment contract with Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell? The answer is unequivocally no. We have a bill pending in the House and Senate that will meet our promises to those who have borne the battle, H.R. 3573.

Sergeant and Mrs. Terrell would be given the same FEHBP plan as our retired Federal civilian workers, at no cost. That means they regain their \$14,000 a year retirement pay, still below the poverty line but at least what they were promised.

At last check, the majority of the Members of this House from both parties have cosponsored this bill, The Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act. Mr. Speaker, let us try to do the right thing and let America keep her word and her honor and pass H.R. 3573 into law before this Congress ends.

#### IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1287, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, President Reagan signed into law the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The new law began with a reasonable scientific approach. The country would search all over the Nation looking for geological formations which were capable of burying high-level nuclear waste. The new law would also consider three sites so as to provide some regional equity to the burden of storing the waste. One site would be in the northeastern part of the country, one site would be in the southeastern United States, and one site would be in the West. These three sites would be studied and then presented to the President of the United States for a decision.

Since then, politics has had more to say to the siting of high-level nuclear waste than the science. After Members of Congress from the Northeast began to openly oppose placing the dump in the Northeast, the Department of Energy unilaterally decided to take them off the list. When placing the dump in the southeastern part of the country came up as a campaign issue in 1984, President Reagan unilaterally decided to take the southeastern part of the country off the list.

These decisions were not based on science, Mr. Speaker. They were based on politics. Then in 1987, the so-called "screw Nevada" bill was passed into law. This bill made the most political of decisions, to designate one site, Yucca Mountain, as the only site, excluding any other consideration from any other region in the country. So if I begin to question the claims of

science from the supporters of dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, it is because I have learned to question from the history of this issue.

Fast forward to the mid 1990s. Nearly a decade has gone by since the "screw Nevada" bill and the scientific evidence against Yucca Mountain is growing. It has become scandalously obvious that Yucca Mountain was the wrong mountain to bet on. It is in an earthquake zone, it is in an underground flooding zone, it is in a volcanic eruption zone, for crying out loud.

On top of that we find out that the rocks at Yucca Mountain cannot contain radiation like the politicians had hoped. So back to the drawing boards to find another way to screw Nevada.

By 1995, illogical legislation took a new direction, something called a temporary storage site in Nevada. The nuclear industry figured they could build a temporary site because it would not have to meet the strict standards of a permanent dump, and once the waste was in Nevada, it would never leave.

But a funny thing happened on the way to a temporary dump. President Clinton promised to veto it and that threat, coupled with the hard work of some Members of the House and the Senate, has frozen the temporary concept for half of a decade.

But now, given that the temporary dump will not fly, we see S. 1287. This is nothing but a transparent effort to throw out radiation standards and sneak the date several years closer for shipping nuclear waste to Nevada. This is nothing but a temporary dump proposal in disguise. The President recognizes that and will veto S. 1287, and the Senate vote already proves the veto will be sustained.

Can we get off this act of futility and move on to worrying about the important issues that confront this Congress, that confront this country, education, health care, Social Security, and campaign finance reform? This is what our constituents want.

□ 1945

That is what the people of Nevada want. We will not stand for 1287, and I ask my colleagues to join with me to stand up and oppose this onerous, ridiculous piece of legislation.

#### JUST SAY NO TO FUNDS FOR COLOMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, we are about to spend almost \$2 billion to escalate the war on drugs in Colombia, while here in the United States 26 million American addicts and alcoholics go untreated.

We have already spent over \$600 million to eradicate drugs at their source

in Colombia. And what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have more than doubled.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin in the United States. Let us face it, our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure.

Congress and the President need to wake up and face reality. Over the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent \$150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet the cocaine market is glutted, as always, and heroin is readily available at record high purities. The number of hard-core addicts continues to increase every day.

Our drug eradication and interdiction efforts have also been a costly failure. As a former United States Navy Commander who led such efforts in Colombia for 3 years said recently, quote, "The \$1.7 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad."

Retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo also said, and I am quoting again, "We cannot make any progress on this drug issue by escalating our presence in Colombia. Instead, we should confront the issue of demand in the United States by providing treatment services to our addicted population."

Mr. Speaker, we need to listen to this veteran of the war on drugs who added, "Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers but on treatment for addicts."

The \$400 million cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans addicted to drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is crazy. This is wrong. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia for drug eradication and interdiction while most of the 26 million addicts and alcoholics in the United States are unable to access treatment. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia even though treatment has been proven to be 23 times more cost effective than eradication of crops and 11 times more cost effective than interdiction.

When will Congress and the President wake up to the basic fact that our Nation's supply-side strategy does not attack the underlying problem of addiction? It is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding to treatment. Now we are down to 18 percent of the funding for treatment. That is a big reason, Mr. Speaker, that fully one-half of the treatment beds are gone that were available here in America 10 years ago. The other reason is that we allow insurance companies to discriminate against the disease of addiction by limiting access to treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defining moment in the 30-year effort to curb illegal drug use in the United States. We